

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The non-final Office Action of June 23, 2009 has been carefully reviewed and these remarks are responsive thereto. Claims 1, 8, 9, 11, 12, 14-17, 19, 20, and 22 have been amended. No new matter has been added. Reconsideration and allowance of the instant application are respectfully requested. Claims 1, 3-4, 6-9, 11-12, 14-17 and 19-28 remain pending.

Objections to the Claims

Claim 8 is objected to as depending from a cancelled claim. Claim 8 has been amended to depend from claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this objection.

Claims 19 and 20 are objected to for lack of antecedent basis of the term “the nonessential”. Claims 19 and 20 have been amended to recite “the nonessential.” Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 9, 11-12, 14-16 and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to nonstatutory subject matter. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Applicants have amended the preamble of claims 9, 11-12, 14-16, and 22 to recite a “machine-readable storage medium.” Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 9, 11-12, 14-16, and 22 are directed to statutory subject matter under 35 U.S.C. § 101.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 9, 17, 21-23, 25 and 28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 5,559,548 to Davis, et al. (“Davis”) in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,960,383 to Fleischer (“Fleischer”).

Claims 3, 4, 8, 11, 12, 16, 19 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davis in view of Fleischer and further in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,279,018 to Kudrolli, et al. (“Kudrolli”).

Claims 6 and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davis et al. in view of Fleischer and further in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,981,217 to Knauff, et al. (“Knauff”).

Claims 7 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davis in view of Fleischer, further in view of Kudrolli, and still further in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,374,225 to Hejna, Jr. (“Hejna”).

Claims 24, 26 and 27 stand rejected under U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davis in view of Fleischer and further in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,169,543 to Wehmeyer (“Wehmeyer”). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Amended claim 1 recites, among other features, “determining a plurality of essential words of the program title based on a meaning of the program title, wherein the plurality of essential words convey the meaning of the program title.”

The Action alleges that Davis discloses determining a plurality of essential words of a program title when the data processor retrieves the longest title that will fit in the designated grid cell. *See* Office Action, page 4. Notably, Davis chooses the longest title that will fit in a designated grid cell by comparing the title to a library containing stored titles that have been previously shortened, and choosing the shortened title. *See*, Davis, col. 17, l. 43 – col. 18, l. 43. Thus, Davis chooses the words that fit in a designated grid cell based *on the words that have previously been used in a shortened title*. Davis does not disclose determining a plurality of essential words of a program title *based on a meaning of the program title*, wherein the essential words convey the meaning of the program title. Furthermore, if there are no stored shortened titles, the titles in Davis are manually shortened by an editor. *See*, Davis, col. 18, ll. 13-44. There is no teaching or suggestion in Davis that the editor determines a plurality of essential words of a program title, based on a meaning of the program title, as recited in claim 1. Accordingly, Davis fails to teach or suggest determining a plurality of essential words of the program title based on a meaning of the program title, such that the plurality of essential words convey the meaning of the program title, as recited in amended claim 1.

Amended claims 9 and 17 include substantially similar features as discussed with respect to claim 1. Accordingly, claims 9 and 17 are patentably distinct over the combination of Davis and Fleischer for substantially similar reasons as claim 1.

Claims 21-23, 25 and 28 ultimately depend from claims 1 or 17 and are therefore patentably distinct over the combination of Davis and Fleischer for at least the same reasons as their ultimate base claims.

Claims 3, 4, 8, 11-12, 16, 19 and 20 ultimately depend from claims 1, 9 or 17. As discussed above with respect to claims 1, 9, and 17, the combination of Davis and Fleischer fails to teach or suggest all of the features of claims 1, 9, and 17. Kudrolli fails to cure the deficiencies of Davis and Fleischer with respect to claims 1, 9, and 17. Accordingly, claims 3, 4, 8, 11-12, 16, 19, and 20 are patentably distinct over the combination of Davis, Fleischer, and Kudrolli.

Claims 6 and 14 depend from claims 1 and 9, respectively. As discussed above with respect to claims 1 and 9, the combination of Davis and Fleischer fail to teach or suggest all of the features of claims 1 and 9. The addition of Knauff fails to cure the deficiencies of Davis and Fleischer with respect to claims 1 and 9. Accordingly, claims 6 and 14 are patentably distinct over the combination of Davis, Fleischer, and Knauff.

Claims 7 and 15 depend from claims 1 and 9, respectively. As discussed above with respect to claims 1 and 9, the combination of Davis and Fleischer fail to teach or suggest all of the features of claims 1 and 9. The addition of Hejna fails to cure the deficiencies of Davis and Fleischer, with respect to claims 1 and 9. Accordingly, claims 7 and 15 are patentably distinct over the combination of Davis, Fleischer, and Hejna.

Claims 24, 26 and 27 depend from claim 17. As discussed above with respect to claim 17, the combination of Davis and Fleischer fail to teach all of the features of claim 17. The addition of Wehmeyer fails to cure the deficiencies of Davis and Fleischer with respect to claim 17. Accordingly, claims 24, 26 and 27 are patentably distinct over the combination of Davis, Fleischer, Wehmeyer for at least the same reasons as claim 17.

CONCLUSION

If any fees are required or if an overpayment is made, the Commissioner is authorized to debit or credit our Deposit Account No. 19-0733, accordingly.

Appln. No.: 09/997,336
Reply to Office Action of June 23, 2009

All rejections having been addressed, Applicants respectfully submit that the instant application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully solicit prompt notification of the same.

Respectfully submitted,

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

Dated: September 23, 2009

By: /Stephanie L. Knapp/
Stephanie L. Knapp
Registration No. 62,473

1100 13th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-4051
Tel: (202) 824-3000
Fax: (202) 824-3001